

**REMARKS**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the telephonic interview with Applicant's representative on 10/05/2007. This supplemental Amendment addresses the Examiner's concerns, which were raised during the interview. The Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

**CONCERNS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112**

During the interview, the Examiner questioned whether the last paragraphs of claims 1, 7 and 11 are supported by the specification. More specifically, the Examiner wishes the Applicant to point out in the relevant paragraphs of the specification that disclose "the first voltage," "the second voltage," "the first effective voltage," "the second effective voltage," and the "third effective voltage."

The first voltage is the voltage applied to the first electrodes through the wiring lines when selected. The second voltage is the voltage applied to the first electrodes through the wiring line when not selected. As shown in paragraphs [0049] and [0050],  $V_0$  is an example of the first voltage because  $V_0$  is "a voltage applied to the n-th common electrode 21...in the n-th selection period." (lines 3 and 4 of paragraph [0049]).  $V_4$  is an example of the second voltage because  $V_4$  is "in non-selection periods" (line 5 and 6 of paragraph [0049]).

The first effective value of a voltage is described as "cross-section-voltage effective value ( $V_{\text{cross}}$ )" in the specification (see paragraphs [0051], [0052]).

Paragraph [0050] describes the relationship among the first voltage, the second voltage and the first effective value of a voltage  $V_{\text{cross}}$  as follows:

When the voltage  $V_0$  is applied to the n-th common electrode 21 from the top in Fig. 1 (that is, the n-th common electrode 21 is selected), the voltage  $V_4$  is applied to the common electrodes 21 from the (n+1)-th common electrode onward. Hence, a voltage of  $|V_0 - V_4|$  is applied to the liquid crystal at the cross sections F between the wiring line connected to the n-th common electrode 21 and the common electrodes 21 from the (n+1)-th common electrode.

The "cross sections F" mentioned immediately above is defined as the intersecting sections "where the common electrodes 21 two-dimensionally intersect with the wiring lines 571 or the wiring lines 572" (lines 3-4 of paragraph [0048]). Accordingly, it is clear that the first effective value of a voltage  $V_{\text{cross}}$  is based on a difference between the first voltage and the second voltage.

The second effective value of a voltage is described as an on-voltage effective value  $V_{\text{on}}$  in the specification (see paragraph [0052]), which is "the voltage applied to the liquid crystal 47 at a subpixel for turning on the subpixel." (paragraph [0052]).

The third effective voltage is described as an off-voltage effective value  $V_{\text{off}}$  in the specification (paragraph [0052]), which is "a voltage applied to the liquid crystal 47 at a subpixel for turning off the subpixel." (paragraph [0052].) Paragraph [0085] explains the relationship between a subpixel and a pixel.

Accordingly, the last paragraphs of claims 1, 7 and 11 are supported by the specification and meet the requirements under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Asakura et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,806,938). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 7 and 11 have been amended to clarify that the display area extends to the inside edges of the sealing material with no gap formed between the display area and the inside edges of the sealing material.

Asakura cannot anticipate claims 1, 7 and 11. First of all, the wiring pattern 5 of Asakura is located **outside** area 3, which is expressly designated in the specification of Asakura as the "display area." Therefore, the wiring pattern 5 does not intersect the transparent common electrode group 4 **in** the display area as required in these claims.

Second, element 10 as shown in Fig. 2 of Asakura cannot be interpreted as the "wiring lines" within the meaning of claims 1, 7 and 11. It should be noted that the "intersections" and "intersecting sections" recited in claims 1, 7 and 11 refer to different parts of the liquid crystal device. "Intersections" refer to the intersections of a plurality of first electrodes on the first substrate and a plurality of second electrodes on the second substrate, which correspond to pixels. "Intersecting sections" (which are called "cross sections" in the specification and the original claims) refer to the area where the wiring lines intersect at least one first electrode other than the corresponding first electrode. Element 10 of Asakura is "transparent segment electrode group" (col. 7, lines 54) and does not function as wiring lines. If element 10 could be interpreted as the wiring lines, then Asakura would not have any electrodes on the rear substrate to form any

"intersections" and corresponding "pixels". Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 7 and 11 be withdrawn.

Claims 2-5, 8-10, and 12 depend on either claim 1 or claim 7 and hence are distinguishable over Asakura for at least the reasons stated above in connection with claims 1 and 7. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Claim 6 is directed to electronic equipment provided with the liquid crystal device according to claim 1 and thus is distinguishable over Asakura for at least the reasons stated above in connection with claim 1.

**CONCLUSION**

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 8, 2007

By

G. Gregory Schivley  
Reg. No. 27,382  
Bryant E. Wade  
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

GGS/BEW/LHW/src